

MINUTES
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
PUBLIC HEARING
JULY 13, 2006

The Lake County Board of Adjustment met Thursday, July 13, 2006 in the Commission Chambers on the second floor of the Round Administration Building in Tavares, Florida to consider requests for variances and any other petitions that may be submitted in accordance with Chapter XIV of the Lake County Land Development Regulations.

Board Members Present:

Howard (Bob) Fox, Jr.
Darren Eslinger
Henry Wolsmann, Vice Chairman
Mary Link Bennett
Donald Schreiner, Chairman
Carl Ludecke

Board Members Not Present:

Ruth Gray

Staff Present:

Terrie Diesbourg, Director, Customer Services Division
Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, Customer Services Division
Anna Ely, Public Hearing Coordinator, Customer Services Division
Sherie Ross, Public Hearing Coordinator, Planning and Development Services Division
Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney

Chairman Schreiner called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. He noted for the record that there was a quorum present, with Ruth Gray not present. He confirmed Proof of Publication for each case as shown on the monitor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CASE NO.</u>	<u>OWNER/ APPLICANT</u>	<u>AGENDA NO.</u>
Consideration of Minutes	June 9, 2006	
Discussion	BOA#60-06-3 (Ruling)	
Withdrawals: BOA#78-06-5	Kenneth R. Blakely, Jr. and W. Fred Blakeley	4
Discussion of Consent Agenda		
Consent Agenda Approval:		
BOA#76-06-5	Nelson Torres/Jeanne Abernathy	2
BOA#77-06-5	Michael and Tia Gruetzmacher/Greg Gruetzmacher	3
BOA#79-06-3	Gary L. and Cheryl S. Pugh/Jennifer and Jason Pugh	5
BOA#80-06-5	Richard and Kathryn Riccard	6
BOA#82-06-2	Eric T. Wahlwender and Susan O. Sonnier	8
BOA#85-06-3	Ronald R. Nichols/Wendy Nichols Berry	11
BOA#86-06-5	Charles R. Criner	12
BOA#87-06-2	Jean Biron Trust/DCS Consulting, Sharon Martin	13
BOA#89-06-2	Herman Van Den Bogaert	15
Regular Agenda:		
BOA#75-06-1	GCIGCCMA, LLC/GCIOCCMA, LLC (George Rada)	1
BOA#81-06-3	Michael A. and Patricia A. Perez	7
BOA#83-06-5	Jackie Willis/Tammie Woodring	9
BOA#84-06-5	Annie L. McCormick	10
BOA#88-06-3	Jeff Bankson	14
Discussion	BOA#57-06-2	
	BOA#60-06-3 (Minutes and Participation)	
	Frank Norviel	
	BOA#60-06-3 (Communications)	
	Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. (SECO)	
	BOA#60-06-3 (Media)	

Minutes

Sherie Ross, Public Hearing Coordinator, said Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, had requested the following change be made in the Board of Adjustment special hearing minutes of June 9, 2006. On page 14, third full paragraph, line 2, “would” should be changed to “can always” as stated on the tape.

MOTION by Mary Link Bennett, SECONDED by Carl Ludecke to approve the June 9, 2006 Board of Adjustment Special Hearing minutes, as amended.

FOR: Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke

AGAINST: None

NOT PRESENT: Gray

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

Discussion of BOA#60-06-3

In response to Carl Ludecke, Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, said the effect of the Board's decision on June 9, 2006 rescinded the third site plan approval, which included both the cement block plant and batch plant. When that was rescinded, it reverted back to the second site plan approval, which includes the cement block plant only. Permits for the block plant were issued under the second site plan. As she explained at the beginning of that special hearing, this Board only had jurisdiction over the order that was entered within 30 days prior to the appeal being filed. The County has two court cases currently on that same issue.

Chairman Schreiner added that if a variance is approved at this public hearing, the owner/applicant should give staff at least 24 hours before proceeding to the zoning counter. He explained the procedure for hearing the cases on the consent agenda. He stated that all letters, petitions, photographs, and other materials presented at this meeting by applicants and those in support or opposition must be submitted to staff prior to proceeding to the next case.

CASE NO.: **BOA#78-06-5**

AGENDA NO.: **4**

OWNERS/APPLICANTS: **Kenneth R. Blakeley, Jr. and
W. Fred Blakeley**

There was no one present to represent the case.

**MOTION by Mary Link Bennett, SECONDED by Henry Wolsmann to accept the withdrawal of
BOA#78-06-5.**

FOR: **Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke**

AGAINST: **None**

NOT PRESENT: **Gray**

MOTION CARRIED: **6-0**

Discussion of Consent Agenda

There was no one on the Board nor anyone in the audience who had an objection to the following cases remaining on the consent agenda: BOA#76-06-5, BOA#77-06-5, BOA#79-06-3, BOA#80-06-5, BOA#82-06-2, BOA#85-06-3, BOA#86-06-5, BOA#87-06-2, and BOA#89-06-2. A citizen in the audience asked that Agenda #7, BOA#81-06-3 be removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda.

CASE NO.:	BOA#76-06-5	AGENDA NO.:	2
OWNER:	Nelson Torres		
APPLICANT:	Jeanne Abernathy		
CASE NO.:	BOA#77-06-5	AGENDA NO.:	3
OWNERS:	Michael and Tia Gruetzmacher		
APPLICANT:	Greg Gruetzmacher		
CASE NO.:	BOA#79-06-3	AGENDA NO.:	5
OWNERS:	Gary L. and Cheryl S. Pugh		
APPLICANTS:	Jennifer and Jason Pugh		
CASE NO.:	BOA#80-06-5	AGENDA NO.:	6
OWNERS/APPLICANTS:	Richard and Kathryn Riccard		
CASE NO.:	BOA#82-06-2	AGENDA NO.:	8
OWNERS/APPLICANTS:	Eric T. Wahlwender and Susan O. Sonnier		
CASE NO.:	BOA#85-06-3	AGENDA NO.:	11
OWNER:	Ronald R. Nichols		
APPLICANT:	Wendy Nichols Berry		
CASE NO.:	BOA#86-06-5	AGENDA NO.:	12
OWNER/APPLICANT:	Charles R. Criner		
CASE NO.:	BOA#87-06-2	AGENDA NO.:	13
OWNER:	Jean Biron Trust		
APPLICANT:	DCS & Consulting, Sharon Martin		
CASE NO.:	BOA#89-06-2	AGENDA NO.:	15
OWNER/APPLICANT:	Herman Van Den Bogaert		

MOTION by Carl Ludecke, SECONDED by Darren Eslinger to take the following actions on the above consent agenda:

BOA#76-06-5	Approval with clarification
BOA#77-06-5	Approval
BOA#79-06-3	Approval
BOA#80-06-5	Approval with conditions
BOA#82-06-2	Approval with conditions
BOA#85-06-3	Approval
BOA#86-06-5	Approval
BOA#87-06-2	Approval with one condition
BOA#89-06-2	Approval

FOR: Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke

AGAINST: None

NOT PRESENT: Gray

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

CASE NO.: BOA#75-06-1

AGENDA NO.: 1

OWNER: GCIGCCMA, LLC
APPLICANT: GCIGCCMA, LLC (George Rada)

Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, presented the case and staff recommendation of denial. She showed the aerial from the staff report on the monitor and submitted a zoning map as County Exhibit A.

When Chairman Schreiner asked if the applicant was informed that this Board is not authorized to grant the requested variance, Ms. Greiner replied, "yes." She added that is on the application as well. In response to Chairman Schreiner, Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, stated that if the applicant has requested to come to this Board, then the Board must hear the case even if it cannot approve the variance because of the Comprehensive Plan.

George Rada was present to represent the case. Mary Link Bennett confirmed with Mr. Rada that he had been told prior to the purchase that this property would be one buildable site.

Mr. Rada stated that this property is in a blighted area. It needs and could use some nice single-family homes for affordable housing. He would like to build three new homes to sell for approximately \$180,000. He felt this would be for the betterment of the community. The neighbors support this request as indicated on the petition in the backup. If improvements are not made, this area will deteriorate further.

Chairman Schreiner explained that this Board cannot amend the Comprehensive Plan; only the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) can do that. Therefore, this Board cannot grant a variance even if the entire Board was in total agreement with the request in this case. This Board is bound by the Comprehensive Plan.

When Mr. Rada asked what he needed to do to get the variance for the three lots, Ms. Greiner said the road would need to be a publicly maintained road so he could check with Public Works to determine if he could go through the process of getting the road adopted under the County maintenance system. He would then need to wait a year to reapply to come back before this Board because the road being under the County maintenance system would be a substantial change.

MOTION by Howard (Bob) Fox, Jr., SECONDED by Mary Link Bennett to deny the variance request in BOA#75-06-1 as it does not meet the criteria in the Comprehensive Plan.

FOR: Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke

AGAINST: None

NOT PRESENT: Gray

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

CASE NO.:**BOA#81-06-3****AGENDA NO.:****7****OWNERS/APPLICANTS:****Michael A. and Patricia A. Perez**

Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, presented the case and staff recommendation of approval with conditions. She showed the aerial and survey with the proposed split from the staff report on the monitor.

Chairman Schreiner confirmed with Ms. Greiner that the deed restriction would be to maintain the portion of the existing road on the front of the smaller parcel; both properties would be required to maintain it. Ms. Greiner said that portion, as well as the easement that leads to the west parcel, would need to be maintained.

James Clark said the notice he received in the mail said the property was to be split into three different parcels. The other lots in the area are ten and 20 acres. He owns 20 acres adjacent to the subject property. Chairman Schreiner said the request is for two parcels. When the owners/applicants originally requested the variance, Ms. Greiner said they had asked for three parcels; they changed the request to two parcels. Mr. Clark said he did not have a problem with two lots.

MOTION by Carl Ludecke, SECONDED by Mary Link Bennett to approve the variance request in BOA#81-06-3 with the following conditions:

- 1. The owners must receive a rezoning on the front portion of the parcel to allow the 3.61-acre parcel.**
- 2. The parcel being created on the west side of the parcel must be at least five acres in size.**
- 3. The two parcels being created through the minor lot split cannot be split further through another minor lot split or through the family density exception process.**
- 4. The owners must record deed restrictions, which require the property owners to maintain the easement (Silverwood Lane) in front of their parcel and the easement that is being created for access to the parcel on the west side. Such restrictions must be recorded prior to the recordation of the approved lot split.**

FOR:**Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke****AGAINST:****None****NOT PRESENT:****Gray****MOTION CARRIED: 6-0**

CASE NO.: BOA#83-06-5

AGENDA NO.: 9

OWNER: Jackie Willis
APPLICANT: Tammie Woodring

Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, presented the case and staff recommendation of denial. She showed the aerial from the staff report on the monitor and submitted a drawing showing how the property would be split as County Exhibit A.

The applicant said her name has been changed to Tammie Woodring-Willis since this application was filed. She asked the Board to reconsider the denial recommendation as there are two lots in the subdivision that have already been split. When Mary Link Bennett asked Ms. Woodring-Willis if she understood the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), Ms. Woodring-Willis replied that she did. She said the code of intent appears to be the major issue. She did not intend to split this property any further.

In response to Chairman Schreiner, Ms. Greiner said a condition could be added to the variance stating that accessory dwelling units would not be permitted on the parcels being created through the family density exception if this variance were granted. Ms. Woodring-Willis said she is allowed to have an accessory dwelling unit, but it can only be 1,200 square feet. She did not feel a family of three could function in a home that size. She said she would not have a problem with that condition. Henry Wolsmann was informed by Ms. Greiner that there are no accessory dwelling units on the property at this time; there may be some outbuildings.

Ms. Greiner noted the letters of opposition in the backup. In response to Darren Eslinger, Ms. Greiner said the existing home is 1,008 square feet of living area. The accessory dwelling could be larger than the existing home.

When Ms. Bennett asked if a house larger than the existing one could be built on the property as the principal dwelling unit and then the existing house could be considered the accessory dwelling unit, Ms. Greiner said that would be possible. Ms. Woodring-Willis said her father did not want to do that. If the proposed house is large enough, Mr. Eslinger said the applicant could add on to the existing home. Ms. Woodridge said she would like to have an 1,800 square foot home. If that house would be considered the primary dwelling unit, Ms. Greiner said the accessory dwelling unit could be 1,200 square feet. If the accessory dwelling unit was 1,800 square feet, Ms. Greiner said the primary residence would have to be over 4,000 square feet of living area. Ms. Greiner added that she did not think that the applicant wanted to build a house that large. Ms. Woodring can build an 1,800 square foot house without a variance. It would be considered the principal dwelling unit. Her father's existing residence would be considered the accessory dwelling unit, but her father does not want to do that.

Ms. Woodring-Willis said it is the last house on the left. No one has to pass the home. The road ends at that point.

If this Board allows the family density exception with the condition that accessory dwelling units would not be allowed on the lots being created, Ms. Greiner said there would be two homes on the property. If the variance is not granted and Ms. Woodring builds an accessory dwelling unit, there would still be two homes on the property. When Carl Ludecke said both lots could not be sold for five years if it is a family density exception, Ms. Woodring-Willis said she understood that.

When Mr. Eslinger asked if this Board should be considering the fact that the other two variances granted allowing the two-acre parcels have already changed the character of the subdivision, Ms. Greiner said the Board could consider that. However, those lots do not have accessory dwellings units. Ms. Woodring-Willis said one of the lots has mother-in-law quarters. Ms. Greiner said it may have been considered an addition rather than an accessory dwelling unit.

At the request of Ms. Eslinger, Ms. Greiner submitted a plan of the subdivision as County Exhibit B and a second aerial as County Exhibit C.

CASE NO.: BOA#83-06-5**AGENDA NO.:** 9**OWNER:** Jackie Willis**PAGE NO.:** 2**APPLICANT:** Tammie Woodring

In response to George Medley, Ms. Greiner explained that the County had received two letters of opposition, both via e-mail. When Mr. Medley asked how many residents were in the subdivision, Ms. Greiner said she did not know. Mr. Medley said he lives just behind the property in question to the north. Although he understood the hardship situation, he was concerned that the two dwelling units could be sold as rental property, changing the character of the subdivision. He was also concerned that if this continues, there will be twice or three times the dwelling units in that area especially since there are alternatives such as extending the house. He did not want to see a permanent change in the neighborhood to accommodate a possible temporary situation.

Ms. Greiner explained that with the family density exception, the lots could be sold separately after five years. If the variance is not granted and an accessory dwelling is placed on the property, they must sign a statement that is recorded in the public records requiring the property to remain under one ownership. Mr. Medley said it would be at least "livable" if the property could not be sold as separate parcels. It would be a compromise.

In response to Carl Ludecke, Ms. Greiner said staff's main objection is the potential of the property being split into two parcels with an accessory dwelling unit on each parcel, resulting in four dwelling units on the subject property. The Code regarding accessory dwelling units was changed in 2001 and 2004. She did not know if the variances were granted prior to being allowed to have accessory dwelling units as is permitted now. If the Board had been told at that time what could have happened, perhaps the variances would not have been granted.

Ms. Woodring said she did not have a problem with a condition prohibiting four dwelling units on this property.

MOTION by Carl Ludecke, SECONDED by Mary Link Bennett to approve the variance request in BOA#83-06-5 with the condition that no accessory dwellings be built on either of the lots being created from henceforth. In addition, no further lots splits shall be permitted.

FOR: Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke**AGAINST:** Wolsmann**NOT PRESENT:** Gray**MOTION CARRIED:** 5-1

CASE NO.:

BOA#84-06-5

AGENDA NO.:

10

OWNER/APPLICANT:

Annie L. McCormick

Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, presented the case and staff recommendation of approval of the request to allow a setback of 14 feet from the right-of-way of Maple Lane and denial of the requested variance to allow the proposed structure to be located within the utility easement. She showed the aerial and site plan from the staff report on the monitor.

In response to Carl Ludecke, Ms. Greiner said this is a utility easement, not a drainage easement.

Ms. Greiner said she had asked the applicant to check with the homeowners' association to determine what is in the easement, but she received no response.

Mr. Ludecke said he also had a problem with the 14-foot setback even though it is a gated community. He confirmed that the applicant owns the lot. Regarding the easement, he was concerned about title problems or possible ramifications from utility companies.

Ms. Greiner said she has no drawings showing where the utilities are located.

Referring to the pictures on page 7 of the staff report, Mary Link Bennett asked about the slab that appears to project past the edge of the mobile home on the property. When she asked if that was in the utility easement, Ms. Greiner said that she does not have a survey; but it should not extend into the utility easement.

Ron Kershner was present as a representative of the Villages' Homeowners' Association and speaking for Annie McCormick. He submitted four pictures as Applicant Exhibit A. In Orange Blossom Gardens, all the utilities are in the backyard. The one coming down the side would be her water line. That line is two feet from the edge of where the slab will be. Therefore, if there was a problem, the slab would not have to be moved. Darren Eslinger was informed by Mr. Kershner that they do not supply their own water.

Regarding the site plan and pictures in the staff report, Mr. Kershner said there is a small part of the slab that will be going into the easement. He said not all houses are 62 feet from the centerline of the road. The garage needs to be this big to accommodate an elevator to get into her house. Ms. McCormick will be wheelchair bound in the future. He added that he lives adjacent to this property and has no problem with the requests. He submitted a survey as Applicant Exhibit B. In response to Mr. Ludecke, Mr. Kershner said the garage will be 20 feet wide and 24 feet long. Mr. Ludecke felt the garage did not need to be that big to meet Ms. McCormick's needs. When Mr. Kershner said the extra space is needed for the elevator lift, Mr. Ludecke said that is not so. Mr. Kershner said the one-story manufactured home shown on the survey has been replaced with another mobile home.

Mr. Ludecke said he has a lot of problems with putting a structure in the utility easement. He felt a 15-foot wide garage would be sufficient and would not extend into the utility easement. Mr. Kershner questioned whether a 15-foot wide garage would match up with the existing house. Chairman Schreiner suggested an 18-foot by 24-foot garage to keep it out of the utility easement. If the garage does not intrude into the utility easement, Ms. Greiner said staff would not have a problem supporting a variance to the 14 feet from the right-of-way. Chairman Schreiner said a current survey is needed.

MOTION by Carl Ludecke, SECONDED by Mary Link Bennett to approve the variance request in BOA#84-06-5 to allow a setback of 14 feet from the right-of-way of Maple Lane.

FOR:

Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke

AGAINST:

None

NOT PRESENT:

Gray

CASE NO.: BOA#84-06-5 AGENDA NO.: 10

OWNER/APPLICANT: Annie L. McCormick PAGE NO.: 2

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

MOTION by Carl Ludecke, SECONDED by Darren Eslinger to deny the variance request in BOA#84-06-5 to allow the proposed structure to be located within the utility easement.

FOR: Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke

AGAINST: None

NOT PRESENT: Gray

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

CASE NO.:

BOA#88-06-3

AGENDA NO.:

14

OWNER/APPLICANT:

Jeff Bankson

Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, presented the case and staff recommendation of denial. She showed the aerial and elevation plan of the proposed dwelling unit from the staff report on the monitor. She said this is strictly an aesthetic condition of the Code.

Darren Eslinger said he has seen this same type of architecture other places, and they are not intended to be skirted or covered. When the Board spoke of similar architecture in Lake County, Ms. Greiner said they were constructed before this Code went into effect. She stated that all dwelling units must meet this Code. In response to Mary Link Bennett, Ms. Greiner said lattice is not considered permanent skirting. Henry Wolsmann was informed by Ms. Greiner that this is one lot of record. It can meet every requirement to build the house there except for the permanent skirting.

Jeff Bankson submitted four pictures as Applicant Exhibit A. Referring to the pictures, he felt that aesthetically the house looks great. The subject property sits on the southernmost City of Leesburg lot line. The north side is commercial and considered the City of Leesburg. His property is in the County on a dead end, non County-maintained road. There is no neighbor across the street. He said he plans to construct a six- or eight-foot fence once the house is built.

When Carl Ludecke asked about utilities, Mr. Bankson said he would have his own well and septic tank. The City of Leesburg has opted not to provide city utilities to his property even though he is adjacent to the City.

Ms. Greiner submitted a wetlands map as County Exhibit A, pointing out the location of the property in relation to the City of Leesburg. When Mr. Ludecke asked why he wanted to put the house "up in the air," Mr. Bankson said his property is sitting at the edge of wetlands.

Ms. Greiner submitted a flood map as County Exhibit B. Mr. Bankson explained that the house would be 25 to 35 feet from the 100-year flood line. When Mr. Ludecke asked about the rise of the property, Mr. Bankson said that from the edge of the property where the wetlands start to the road, the rise is about six feet. In response to Mr. Ludecke, Mr. Bankson said he will need to put in a mounded septic system. It will be located on the south side to the east toward the road. Mr. Ludecke said a mounded system may not be aesthetically pleasing if the house is also at a higher elevation.

Ms. Greiner reiterated that the intent of the Code regarding this variance request is strictly aesthetics. The purpose of the permanent skirting is to keep the neighbors from having to look at items that are stored underneath. Mr. Bankson said he is a mechanic and will be opening up a business away from this property. Mr. Eslinger was informed that the street will be six to eight feet higher than where the house will be located.

When Mr. Ludecke asked how far back the house will be from the road, Mr. Bankson said it will be 35 to 45 feet; he had to get an average setback. There are only two homes on the street.

Ms. Greiner showed the pictures from the staff report on the monitor. She said they were taken from the street.

When Chairman Schreiner asked about picture 1 of Applicant Exhibit A, Mr. Bankson said that is a Jim Walters home built in Tampa. If this Board should decide to grant this variance, Chairman Schreiner said a screening requirement of landscaping around the house could be added. Mr. Eslinger said he was thinking the same thing, only more toward the edge of the property especially on the neighbor's side and the roadside. Chairman Schreiner said he had suggested landscaping around the building as that would cover everything as the permanent skirting would. The owner would be required to maintain the landscaping. Mr. Eslinger said that if he lived there, he would not want to crawl through bushes to get to his house. Chairman Schreiner noted the stairs in the front of the house.

CASE NO.: BOA#88-06-3 **AGENDA NO.:** 14

OWNER/APPLICANT: Jeff Bankson **PAGE NO.:** 2

When Chairman Schreiner asked if the house would have a garage, Mr. Bankson said he would like to add one eventually. He owns the mobile home he lives in now and has lived in it for five years. His plan is to sell the mobile home and use that money for this new home. If a garage is added, Chairman Schreiner said it would need to be located to the left of the front entrance, and the ingress/egress would be by the front steps or elevator. Mr. Bankson said he was planning a walkway of crushed rock or shell on the north side, next to the commercial property. If aesthetics is the issue in this case, Chairman Schreiner felt that screening the house from the neighbors and the front should be a consideration. Taking into account where this is located, Mr. Eslinger questioned the need to screen it.

In response to Mr. Ludecke, Mr. Bankson said he owns 333 total feet into the wetlands. He was agreeable to providing whatever the Board determines is necessary.

Mr. Eslinger was informed by Mr. Bankson that his proposed house would be directly in line or two to three feet closer to the road than the yellow house shown in picture 4 of Applicant Exhibit A in order to accommodate the wetlands. Ms. Greiner submitted a survey as County Exhibit C. She said the house will be 57 feet from the wetlands and 30 feet from the right-of-way of Elizabeth Lane. Mr. Bankson said the stairs will be in the back of the house.

Mr. Ludecke felt a six-foot vegetative buffer near the front property line would be adequate. Mr. Eslinger said he would want the buffer to be between the two houses from the front back 64 feet. Mr. Ludecke said a buffer on the left side between the houses could be a wooden privacy fence or a vegetative hedge. However, he did not feel a privacy fence on the front of the house would be appropriate; he felt a four- to six-foot vegetative buffer would be better.

Chairman Schreiner confirmed that the proposed septic tank would be on the left side. When he said the proposed garage would also be on the left side, Mr. Bankson said it would be to the right and front. In response to Chairman Schreiner, Ms. Greiner said that would not meet the setback requirements; Mr. Bankson would have to request a variance.

MOTION by Darren Eslinger, SECONDED by Carl Ludecke to approve the variance request in BOA#88-06-3 with the condition that a six-foot high privacy fence or vegetative screen shall be placed on the south side of the property from the front of the property to the back of the house. Along the front, there shall be a minimum four-foot high vegetative screen along the length of the road frontage excluding the driveway and right-of-way.

FOR: Fox, Jr., Eslinger, Wolsmann, Bennett, Schreiner, Ludecke

AGAINST: None

NOT PRESENT: Gray

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

Discussion

Regarding BOA#57-06-2, heard in May of 2006, Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, said that one of the conditions this Board had placed on the storage unit and carport was that they had to have the building permit by June 11, 2006. If the permit was not obtained by the date, the storage unit and carport must be removed permanently. A permit was never obtained, and both are still on the property. Therefore, the County is now taking the applicants before the Special Master. She will update the Board after it is brought before the Special Master.

Chairman Schreiner commended the Board members who participated in the special hearing of June 9, 2006 regarding BOA#60-06-3. He felt the Board thoroughly discussed the case. He also commended Sherie Ross, Public Hearing Coordinator, for her diligent work in transcribing the tapes so accurately.

Frank Norviel spoke of some problems he has with his home and said he will be coming before this Board in the future. Ms. Greiner said he would need a lot of record determination done to see if the lots must be aggregated together to be one building site or if it would be considered two buildable sites. That can be done in the Zoning Division. When he spoke of concerns about his well and septic system, Ms. Greiner said he could contact Environmental Health.

Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, said the County Attorney's office has had people come in from the Woodlands development regarding this Board's contact information. They have 30 days to appeal the Order that was signed by the Chairman on that particular case; she thought that would be July 20. She cautioned the Board to remember that if they should receive any communication, that case still has the potential to come back to this Board.

In that same vein, Chairman Schreiner stated that there is a potential problem that may come before this Board regarding a new Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. (SECO) operation center. Some neighbors are opposing it. He cautioned the Board not to discuss the situation if any member is contacted. If there is any possibility that it could come before the Board, Ms. Marsh agreed that it would be better to avoid any contact.

When Mary Link Bennett spoke of a phone call she had received, Ms. Marsh reminded the Board that it does not have any obligation to speak with the media.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherie Ross
Public Hearing Coordinator

Donald Schreiner
Chairman